

Community college presidents' perceptions of intercollegiate athletics

**Mitchell R.
Williams**

**Kevin
Pennington**

Dr. Williams is an Assistant Professor and Director of the Master's Degree Programs in Community College Administration and Community College Teaching at Western Carolina University in Cullowhee, North Carolina.

Dr. Pennington is an Associate Professor and Director of the Doctoral Program in Community College Leadership at Western Carolina University in Cullowhee, North Carolina.

The study examines community college presidents' perceptions about two-year college intercollegiate athletics. Presidents in six states were surveyed about their perceptions of whether community college athletics: (a) enhances pride in the institution among various constituencies, (b) increases enrollment and augments student recruitment, (c) has appropriate financial and administrative procedures, and (d) supports the mission of the community college. Findings indicate the presidents believe athletics promote pride in the institution among students and the general community and promote community interaction with the campus. There was general agreement among leaders of institutions with and without athletic teams that the athletics budget process and procedures for establishing new teams are not well understood by institutional leaders. Finally, there was significant disagreement among leaders about whether intercollegiate athletics supports the mission of the community college.

More than any other force, athletics has tended to distort the values of college life and to increase its emphasis upon the material and the monetary. Indeed, at no point in the education process has commercialism of college athletics wrought more mischief than in its effect upon the American undergraduate.

Howard J. Savage (1929)

FEW ENDEAVORS in higher education create more excitement, debate, and controversy than intercollegiate athletics. There seems to be a connection between athletic teams and a number of university-related activities including student recruitment and retention, fund-raising, alumni relations, scholarship, student life, and community relations (Toma & Cross, 1998). In the past few years, several studies have examined the role that intercollegiate athletics plays in a four-year institution's campus community

(Shaul, 2001; Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Suggs, 2004). These studies have questioned whether athletics at the university level (a) affect pride in the institution among various constituencies such as students, faculty and staff, and the general community, (b) influence enrollment and student recruitment, (c) determine financing and administrative procedures related to athletics, and (d) support the mission of higher education.

These studies have also examined myths and perceived problems related to college sports (Shulman & Bowen, 2001), usually with an eye on Division One athletic programs at nationally-recognized universities. They have presented data showing how intercollegiate athletics affect these institutions of higher education and their missions. High profile athletic programs draw a great deal of scrutiny by the media, the public, and researchers. Even Ivy League universities and selective liberal arts colleges are included in some studies (Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

Athletic programs at two-year institutions, however, have not been thoroughly examined. While intercollegiate athletics has a long tradition at community colleges in several states, two-year institutions in some states are investigating whether to initiate or expand intercollegiate athletic programs (Hines, 2005). Several of the same questions that are commonly raised concerning athletics at four-year institutions could be raised with regard to community colleges. For

example, are athletics diluting or contributing to the mission of the community college? Does the existence of an intercollegiate athletic program enhance a community college's enrollment and the diversity of the students who enroll? Is there adequate funding for intercollegiate athletics at most community colleges, and are appropriate administrative procedures in place to establish, support, and evaluate the benefit of athletic teams?

It has been said that a university's athletic teams are its most visible links to the public—building alumni, donor, and community relations as well as student pride in the institution (Holbrook, 2004). Is the same true for community colleges, institutions which traditionally work with very different student populations? There is some evidence that that may be the case. As early as 1891, William Rainey Harper, then the President of the University of Chicago but later considered to be a key leader in the early community college movement, was a “trend setter in using athletic success as a means of publicizing his institution and attracting students” (Slaughter, 1989, p. 181). Rainey wrote a letter to his new athletic director, Amos Alonzo Stagg, indicating his support for intercollegiate athletics and his strong desire for a team that “we can send around the country and knock out all the colleges” (p. 182).

Data regarding intercollegiate athletic programs at community colleges is limited, and two-year college leaders may not have had

the opportunity to learn from the experiences of their colleagues at institutions with long athletic traditions. The lack of information can limit a leader's ability to make informed decisions regarding the creation, continuation, or dissolution of intercollegiate athletic teams. According to Eugene Tobin, coordinator of the College Sports Project at the Mellon Fund, it is particularly important for presidents of small colleges to obtain accurate information about their athletic programs because there is so much anecdotal evidence that may be misleading. It is sometimes a challenge for leaders to get a complete grasp of the intercollegiate athletic experience on their campus and its effect on their institution (Suggs, 2004). Such information can be especially important to community college leaders whose institutions face pressure to add new athletic programs, expand the number of existing athletic teams, terminate teams or programs, or continue a commitment not to offer intercollegiate athletics.

To add to the existing knowledge about athletics at community colleges, the present study investigates the perceptions of two-year college presidents regarding intercollegiate athletics. Besides answering questions about the effect athletics has on student, faculty, and community pride in the institution and their impact on student recruitment and enrollment, leaders provided their perceptions concerning the process for establishing new athletic teams and the budget

for intercollegiate athletics at the community college.

Background and literature review

The relationship between intercollegiate athletics and higher education has been questioned by many, but "the centrality of athletics in the life of American colleges and universities is undeniable" (Bogue & Aper, 2000, p. 180). Addressing the relationship between higher education and athletics, the current literature suggests four general topic areas: (a) how intercollegiate athletics affect pride in the institution among various constituencies including students, faculty and staff members, and the general community regarding the institution, (b) whether intercollegiate athletics affect student recruitment and enrollment, (c) administrative and financial procedures related to intercollegiate athletic programs, and (d) whether intercollegiate athletic programs help an institution fulfill its mission.

Today, more than 540 two-year institutions are members of the National Junior College Athletics Association (NJCAA), which is based in Colorado Springs. NJCAA is the governing body of intercollegiate athletics for two-year colleges. Its programs are designed to meet the needs of student-athletes who come from both traditional and non-traditional backgrounds and whose reasons for selecting a two-year college may be as varied as their life experiences (National Junior Col-

lege Athletic Association). The Association has taken a leading role in issues such as athletes' eligibility requirements, academic work and institutional responsibility for athletes' academic progress, and season length (Campion, 1990).

According to the literature, there is a general feeling that the success of intercollegiate athletic teams enhances the perception of an institution of higher learning in the eyes of students and potential students, faculty and staff members, and the members of the general community within the institution's service region (Sperber, 2000). Likewise, there is a belief that intercollegiate athletics (and successful teams) lead to an increase in the number of students interested in an institution, in the diversity of applicants, and the number of students who actually enroll in a college or university (Sperber, 2000; Toma & Cross, 1998). Additionally, there is a logical expectation that decisions regarding budget issues and administrative functions related to intercollegiate athletics (e.g., how teams are funded, whether future funding is secure, how new teams are created) are made on the basis of dependable and reliable information (Shaul, 2001; Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Finally, there is a general assessment that intercollegiate athletics support the mission of an institution of higher learning (Holbrook, 2004).

Questions remain, however, about the relationship between athletics at the two-year college and the basic mission and philoso-

phy of the community college. One reason suggested for the lack of research on the unanswered questions is that many community colleges do not feel the same demand for on-the-field success that is present at many four-year institutions. While community colleges have, at times, been accused of rushing to establish athletic programs so they can feed university programs (Bogue & Aper, 2000), questions remain about the institutional benefits of the programs.

A general perception suggests that two-year institutions do not receive the same benefits large, four-year institutions receive from intercollegiate athletic programs. For example, Toma and Cross (1998) found that championship seasons tend to yield increases in applications. They called for further research on whether similar situations apply to other types of institutions of higher education. Using the example of the University of Louisville's basketball success, they also pointed out the non-traditional student often attracted to the community college may not be affected by athletic team success:

In the case of Louisville, one explanation for the impact of championship seasons being felt less strongly could be that it receives applications from more older and part-time students. These students are more likely to be place-bound and less concerned about factors such as college sports in choosing their school. (Toma & Cross, 1998, p. 654)

At the community college, it is unclear whether growth in the number and scope of athletic programs is thoughtfully planned or occurring without benefit of discussion on how new teams are established, whether the institutional budget supports athletics, whether intercollegiate athletics support the mission and philosophy of the college. The purpose of the current study is to provide data which will help community college leaders to make informed decisions about these questions.

One way to examine athletics at two-year colleges is to investigate the perceptions of college presidents regarding the effect that intercollegiate athletics have on community colleges. While some may question whether presidents have ever really been in charge of athletic programs on their campuses (Slaughter, 1989), their perceptions may be helpful to institutional leaders exploring the possibility of initiating, expanding, or terminating intercollegiate athletic programs. The community college president's first obligation is "to know what's going on. In too many instances, the president either does not investigate what is happening in the athletic program or is just kept in the dark" (Brown, 1989, p. 173). Presidents are often criticized for not fully discharging their responsibility to oversee athletic programs. They may unfairly be characterized as figureheads who can be undermined by athletic directors, coaches, and athletic booster clubs (Slaughter, 1989).

Methods

In order to gather data on two-year college presidents' perceptions, a survey instrument was developed based upon a review of the literature and conversations with community college presidents. The instrument measures institutional leaders' attitudes (i.e., beliefs or knowledge) about intercollegiate athletics at the community college, using Likert-type items with declarative statements that ask respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statements (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Response options include *strongly agree*, *agree*, *neutral*, *disagree*, and *strongly disagree*. The neutral option gives respondents the opportunity to indicate that they have no strong preference regarding a statement, but the neutral option is not to be considered a response of "do not know" (Patten, 1998).

The instrument was pilot tested and revised, with several items discarded or rephrased. The final instrument contained thirteen Likert-type items, with space available for respondents' comments after each item, and two open-ended items asking respondents the most positive and most negative aspects of having intercollegiate athletics at the community college. The only descriptive data gathered with the survey instrument was the status of intercollegiate athletics at the respondents' institution.

Surveys were mailed to all 163 community college presidents in six

states: Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio, Oregon, North Carolina, and Virginia. These states were selected because their community colleges represent various stages of intercollegiate athletics: colleges with no teams, colleges planning to initiate teams, colleges with relatively new teams, and colleges with well-established programs. Responses were received from 88 institutions, an over-all response rate of 54%. The response by status of intercollegiate athletic programs is as follows:

- 44 respondents had no intercollegiate athletic teams
- 2 respondents had no intercollegiate athletic teams but are planning to add teams
- 6 respondents have had intercollegiate athletic teams for three years or less
- 36 respondents have had intercollegiate athletics teams for more than three years.

Since the response rate was very low in two categories, responses have been grouped according to community colleges with intercollegiate athletic teams (48% of the total respondents) and community colleges without athletic teams (52% of the total respondents).

Findings

Items on the survey instrument question whether athletics promote institutional pride among three constituencies of the community college: students, faculty and staff, and the general community. As indicated in Table 1, for each of these items the presidents felt that intercollegiate athletics promote pride in a community college. Even among leaders whose institutions did not have teams, a majority felt athletics promote pride in the institution among students and the community.

Table 1. Community college presidents' perceptions whether intercollegiate athletics promote pride in the community college

Item	Response category	Agreement (%)
Athletics promote student pride	Total response	75
	With athletic teams	97
	Without teams	58
Athletics promote faculty/staff pride	Total response	50
	With athletic teams	61
	Without teams	37
Athletics promote community pride	Total response	72
	With athletic teams	80
	Without teams	65

Four items on the survey instrument explore issues of student recruitment and enrollment. These items elicited considerable disagreement between the perceptions of presidents with intercollegiate athletic teams and those without teams. Presidents with teams at their colleges perceived athletics to have a more positive influence on student diversity, higher enrollment, the interest of local students in the college, and the over-all reputation of the college among potential students (see Table 2).

Four items on the survey instrument ask leaders' perceptions about financing and administration of athletic programs. The responses reveal a wide variety of opinions. The presidents responding to the survey overwhelmingly indicate athletics at the community col-

lege do not have a secure funding base (79% of respondents), and the budget for athletics is not well understood by college leaders (64% of respondents). Also not fully understood by the college's leaders is the process for establishing new athletic teams; only 26% indicate it is understood by institutional leaders. Finally, there were generally negative responses that the number of athletic teams at the community college would increase in the future (see Table 3).

The final two items on the survey instrument concern the presidents' perceptions whether intercollegiate athletics promote community interaction with the college and whether athletics support the mission of the college. The findings indicate that leaders of institutions with athletic teams do

Table 2. Community college presidents' perceptions of the influence of intercollegiate athletics on student enrollment and recruitment.

Item	Response category	Agreement (%)
Athletics promote student diversity	Total response	70
	With athletic teams	83
	Without teams	59
Athletics lead to higher enrollment	Total response	59
	With athletic teams	78
	Without teams	47
Athletics encourage local students to attend	Total response	61
	With athletic teams	77
	Without teams	47
Athletics increase the college's reputation	Total response	59
	With athletic teams	80
	Without teams	42

feel athletics promote community interaction with the college and that athletics support the mission of the community colleges. However, leaders of institutions without athletic teams disagree strongly on these issues. The largest disparity between leaders of institutions with teams and those without teams addresses whether athletics support the mission of the community college. Eighty-nine percent of those with athletics teams indicated that athletics support the mission, while only 32% of presidents without teams agreed (see Table 4).

Discussion of findings

Community college athletic programs have a long and proud tradition in many states. Even though some states do not have athletics

at their colleges, athletic programs are “emerging” in many other states. Where community college athletics fit within intercollegiate sports is unclear. For example, have colleges moved beyond what Sperber (2000) referred to as the “JUCO (junior college) loophole,” i.e., that athletes attending a junior college did not need to meet a minimum score on the SAT/ACT exam prior to transferring to a four-year institution? “Many junior colleges do not provide quality educations; numerous JUCO transfers cannot do university work, even in ‘gut courses’” (p. 240). At the same time, is it fair to question whether intercollegiate sports fit within the mission of the community college?

Survey respondents generally agree that intercollegiate athletics

Table 3. Community college presidents’ perceptions of financial and administrative issues related to intercollegiate athletics.

Item	Response category	Agreement (%)
Athletics have secure funding	Total response	11
	With athletic teams	17
	Without teams	0
Athletics budget is well understood	Total response	28
	With athletic teams	31
	Without teams	19
Process for establishing new athletic teams is well understood	Total response	26
	With athletic teams	33
	Without teams	14
The number of athletic teams will increase	Total response	36
	With athletic teams	39
	Without teams	31

promote pride in the community college among three main constituency groups. Presidents of institutions with or without athletic teams strongly indicate that athletics promote pride in the college among students and the general community or service region although this sentiment is stronger among leaders of institutions with teams. Among both groups of leaders, the idea that athletics promote pride among college faculty and staff members is considerably less strong: 61% of leaders of institutions with teams agree with the idea, but only 37% of leaders of institutions without teams agree. Regarding enrollment, respondents generally agree that intercollegiate athletics promote student diversity (70%), lead to higher enrollment (59%), and encourage local students to continue their education (61%).

Some of the most interesting findings concern financing and budgetary considerations involved in intercollegiate athletics at the community college. Only 11% of respondents said athletics have

a secure funding base, including only 17% of presidents of institutions with athletic teams. At the same time, only 28% of respondents indicate that the budget process for athletics is well understood by community college leaders, and only 26% of respondents indicate that the process for establishing a new athletic team is understood by college leaders. Among leaders of institutions with established teams, only 31% feel the budget process is well understood, and only 33% say the process for establishing new teams is understood.

The largest disparity between the perceptions of leaders of institutions with athletic teams and those without teams focuses on whether athletics support the mission of the community college. Eighty-nine percent of leaders from institutions with athletic teams feel that athletics support the mission of the community college, while only 32% of leaders from institutions without teams feel the same way.

Table 4. Community college presidents' perceptions whether intercollegiate athletics promote community interaction and support the mission of the college.

Item	Response category	Agreement (%)
Athletics promote community interaction	Total response	75
	With athletic teams	92
	Without teams	64
Athletics support the mission of the college	Total response	60
	With athletic teams	89
	Without teams	32

Conclusions

One of the interesting findings of this survey is the large percentage of neutral responses from leaders of community colleges without athletic teams. That indicates the need for further study and for more information about the impact of intercollegiate athletics at two-year colleges. Further, when examining the findings of the study, it is important to remember that although a neutral response on a Likert-scale item does not necessarily mean “do not know” (Patten, 1998), that may well be the case in this study.

Funding, budgeting, establishing teams

The findings of the study may help explain why many community colleges do not have intercollegiate athletic teams despite a positive perception that having teams enhances institutional reputation among students, faculty/staff, and the community. There is general acknowledgement in some states that funding and administrative support are among the things that community college athletic directors feel need improvement (Hines, 2005). Perhaps leaders in states where athletic teams are not well-established do not have a clear understanding of administrative procedures necessary to initiate an athletics program or to add new teams. Further, there appears to be wide-spread misunderstanding about funding issues related to intercollegiate athletics at community colleges. Funding is the is-

sue most frequently mentioned in respondents' additional comments to the survey instrument. For example, leaders wrote the following:

- Teams are a strain on college resources, as there is no established funding for athletics.
- We are constantly scrambling for funding support because of state restrictions on spending on athletic teams. The State is very short-sighted in this regard and demonstrates a Division One bias.
- Too many community colleges hire coaches who are accustomed to athletics at the university system. We cannot afford the salary or athletic facilities.

Lack of a secure funding base, a minimal understanding of the processes for establishing new athletic teams, and unclear understanding of the budget process for athletics may support the determination not to have athletic teams at some community colleges. Additionally, questions have arisen regarding failure of community colleges to comply with federal gender equity regulations for intercollegiate athletics (Evelyn, 2002). Indeed, one respondent to the survey said that the community college's “inability to recruit adequate numbers of women athletes has significant implications for Title IX compliance at our college.” It seems logical that institutional leaders who do not understand these factors are hesitant to establish intercollegiate athletic teams when they do not understand the effect such teams can have on institutional budgets,

administrative procedures, and fulfilling the mission of the institution.

Institutional pride

The survey results on pride in the institution among various constituency groups are not surprising. Leaders of institutions with athletic teams strongly feel that having teams promotes student (97% agreed) and community pride (80% agreed) in the college, while leaders of institutions without teams agree with the perception at much lower rates (58% and 65% agreed). The perceptions of both groups of respondents are considerably lower regarding the effect on faculty and staff pride (61% of respondents with teams agreed and 37% of those without teams agreed). Several written comments about “pride in the institution” are insightful. A leader of a community college with well-established athletic teams wrote, “Our athletes are poorly prepared academically, and they hurt the over-all image of our college in the community, but we need their FTEs.” A president who had recently moved from a college with strong athletic teams to a college with no teams stated:

All of the items dealing with institutional pride were much more important at institutions in rural areas with colleges that provided dorms. Institutional pride issues were significantly reduced in the more urban setting.

Whether the availability of intercollegiate athletics encourages

local students to continue their education is perceived differently by leaders of institutions with teams and those without teams. Seventy-seven percent of respondents from institutions with teams agree that intercollegiate athletics encourage local students to continue their education, but only 47% of respondents from institutions without teams agree. Further study to determine if local students are selectively chosen for athletic teams and if the selection influences perceptions about the reputation of the college would be beneficial.

Enrollment

It is interesting to note that leaders of institutions without athletic teams as well as those with teams both perceive that the institutional reputation is enhanced by having athletic teams. The same is true for the perception that having intercollegiate athletic teams enhances enrollment. Overall, 59% of respondents agree that athletics enhance a community college’s enrollment. Among leaders of institutions with teams, 78% agree, but for leaders of institutions without teams, only 47% agree. Whether athletic teams provide an added incentive for students who would attend regardless is an unanswered question. One president has written, “Our teams help to attract and retain students who are interested in our academic programs and for whom participation on an athletics team is a strong bonus.” An opposite opinion is expressed by a president of an institution which

no longer has athletic teams: "Our experience was a disaster. Athletics hurt the reputation of the college and attracted the wrong type of students. It brought us students with too many problems, and they embarrassed the college."

The quality of the students attracted to community colleges by intercollegiate athletics is questioned by several presidents at institutions without athletic programs. One respondent writes, "Some of our athletes have rightly earned the reputation among our faculty as being disruptive in class and only enrolling so they can participate in sports." Further study is needed to determine if the so-called "Flutie Factor" (Sperber, 2000, p. 60)—that applications for admission to institutions of higher education increase with well-publicized athletic victories—applies to community colleges. It would be interesting to determine if the perceptions of institutional leaders concerning the positive effect of athletics on a community college's institutional reputation and enrollment are supported. One side of the argument may be expressed by a respondent from a community college which no longer has intercollegiate teams: "Most community college students could not care less about athletics. They come to prepare for the workforce or to complete the first two years of a baccalaureate program. We recently eliminated the entire athletic program and emphasized educational quality. We received no student complaints." An opposing example

is reflected in the comments of a president at a community college with success in both baseball and volleyball: "Thirty baseball and 15 volleyball players would not have attended our college without intercollegiate athletics. At the same time, since we added these sports, we have experienced an increase in total college transfer enrollment."

Perceptions that intercollegiate athletics increase student diversity are very different for leaders of institutions with teams (83% agree) and those without teams (59% agree). Leaders may perceive that athletics are playing an important role in giving opportunities to students who are members of groups historically under-served by higher education. As a president of a college with well-established teams comments on the survey, "Athletics contribute immensely to helping us achieve a much-desired goal of having a more diverse student body."

College mission

The findings about athletic programs supporting the mission of the community college are among the most interesting results of the survey but provide no clear and final resolution. Leaders at institutions with athletic teams overwhelmingly agree that athletics support the mission of the college, while leaders of institutions without teams have no strong perceptions on the issue. Leaders at institutions with teams may use the comprehensive mission of the community college to justify or rationalize the exist-

tence of intercollegiate teams.

“Big time” university athletics programs seem to continuously come under scrutiny from faculty, alumni, legislators, and the public. Nevertheless, the number of four-year institutions moving to so-called “Division One” athletics continues to grow as the institutions seek the rewards of enhanced pride in the institution among various constituencies, enrollment growth and increased diversity among students, and support for the mission of higher education through intercollegiate athletics.

The present study has investigated the perceptions of community college presidents in six states about intercollegiate athletics at two-year colleges. The information generated can be of value to institutional leaders, athletic directors,

faculty members, and students who may be affected by decisions to initiate, expand, terminate, or continue to avoid intercollegiate athletics at the community college. Whatever decisions college leaders make regarding athletics should be informed decisions and in the community college tradition of creating a student-centered learning environment. As Hollbrook (2004) and others have said of the future of university athletics, the challenge is not to separate athletics and keep it from diluting academics. The challenge is to take advantage of the tremendous opportunities available to boost academic opportunities by embracing athletics, thereby strengthening connections with faculty, staff, and the community, thus creating a richer community college experience for all students.

References

- Bogue, E.G., & Aper, J. (2000). *Exploring the heritage of American higher education: The evolution of philosophy and policy*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Brown, R.C., Jr. (1989). The role of the community college president. In R.E. Lapchick & J.B. Slaughter (Eds.), *The rules of the game: Ethics in college sport* (pp. 171-178). New York: Macmillan.
- Campion, W.J. (1990). The National Junior College Athletic Association: A study in organizational accountability. *Community College Review*, 17(4), 47-51.
- Evelyn, J. (2002, February 8). California two-year colleges criticized on Title IX. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48(22), A40.
- Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Hines, M. (2005, July 7). Athletes find a home at North Carolina's Community Colleges. *North Carolina Community College System Website*. Retrieved November 5, 2005 from http://www.ncccs.cc.nc.us/News_Releases/CC_Athletics.htm

-
- Holbrook, K.A. (2004). Jumping through hoops: Can athletics enhance the academic mission? *The Presidency*, 7(1), 24-31.
- National Junior College Athletic Association. (2005). *NCJAA Purpose Statement*. Retrieved September 17, 2005, from <http://www.njcaa.org/purpose.cfm>
- Patten, M.L. (1998). *Questionnaire research: A practical guide*. Los Angeles: Pyrczak.
- Savage, H.J. (1929). *American college athletics*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Shaul, M.S. (2001). Intercollegiate athletics. Four-year colleges' experiences adding and discontinuing teams. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office [GAO-01-297].
- Shulman, J.L., & Bowen, W.G. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Slaughter, J.B. (1989). Where was the president? A president's responsibility for change in intercollegiate athletics. In R.E. Lapchick & J.B. Slaughter (Eds.), *The rules of the game: Ethics in college sport* (pp. 179-191). New York: Macmillan.
- Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York: Holt.
- Suggs, W. (2004, September 3). Mellon Fund tackles college sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(2), A43-44.
- Toma, J.D., & Cross, M.E. (1998). Intercollegiate athletics and student choice: Exploring the impact of championship seasons on undergraduate applications. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(6), 633-660.



Copyright of *The Community College Enterprise* is the property of Schoolcraft College, and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted on a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.